

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 32 are independent. Claims 7, 11-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,275,225 to ("Rangajaran").

112 REJECTIONS

Claim 7 stands rejected under Section 112 because the term "the map" lacks antecedent basis. The applicant has amended claim 7, as well as claims 5, 6, and 8, to depend from claim 4, which provides antecedent basis for the term at issue. The applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes the Section 112 rejection.

The Examiner rejects claims 11-20 under Section 112 because the term "the associated function and appearance" in claim 11 lacks antecedent basis. The applicant has deleted the term at issue from claim 11 and added the term "the associated map component and fashion component", for which there is antecedent basis. The applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes the Section 112 rejection of claims 11-20.

Claim 35 stands rejected under Section 112 as not complying with the enablement requirement. Claim 35 recites that the device is a telephone. The Examiner states that a telephone cannot provide an interface. The applicant must respectfully disagree. As indicated on page 4, lines 14-16, of and elsewhere in the applicant's specification, a speech driven computer can interact with a user through a voice user interface, which can be implemented by using a telephone. The applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to implement the described voice user interface without undue experimentation and, furthermore, that claim 35 complies with the enablement requirement of Section 112.

102 REJECTIONS

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangajaran. The applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "reading a function description of a first function to be

provided by the user interface, the function description including logic for selecting an appearance of the user interface.” The applicant respectfully submits that Rangajaran does not disclose or suggest such an element. For at least this reason, claim 1 and claims 2-10, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangajaran. The applicant has amended claim 11 to recite “associating a map component and a fashion component on the fly at run time to generate the user interface, the map component including logic for changing one of the map component and the fashion component.” The applicant respectfully submits that Rangajaran does not disclose or suggest such an element. For at least this reason, claim 11 and claims 12-20, which depend from claim 11, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangajaran. The applicant has amended claim 21 to recite “read a function description of a first function to be provided by the user interface, the function description including logic for selecting an appearance of the user interface.” As explained with reference to claim 1, claim 21 and claims 22-30, which depend from claim 21, are in condition for allowance. The applicant has amended claims 24-28 to remove errors.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangajaran. The applicant has amended claim 11 to recite “associate a map component and a fashion component on the fly at run time to generate the user interface, the map component including logic for changing one of the map component and the fashion component.” As explained with reference to claim 11, claim 31 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangajaran. The applicant has amended claim 11 to recite “means for associating a map component and a fashion component on the fly at run time to generate the user interface, the map component including logic for changing one of the map component and the fashion component.” As explained with respect to claim 11, claim 32 and claims 33-35, which depend from claim 32, are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Robert J. Chansler
Serial No. : 09/467,310
Filed : December 17, 1999
Page : 10 of 10


Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-280001 / P254

The applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement and a form PTO-1449 on April 4, 2003. The applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the cited references and return the initialed and signed form PTO-1449.

The applicant believes that no fees or credits are due with the present response. Please apply any appropriate charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 8, 2003



Tim H. Pham
Reg. No. 48,589

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071